FANTASTIKA JOURNAL – PEER REVIEW

Thank you for agreeing to review this article. You should have received a Word document containing the article, an abstract and any images or relevant information. The document should be anonymous. If this is NOT the case, please return it.

Please fill out the following comment sheet. If any comments need to be made directly on the article itself, we ask that reviewers use the 'track changes' and 'comments' features of WORD. These can both be found under the 'Review' tab on the main Word menu bar. Before you begin reviewing the piece, please turn on 'Track Changes' and 'save as' the document with its current title, adding the word 'annotated' to the file name. E.g. 'Dream Deferred – annotated.doc'. Please anonymise your document when you save it by removing the name of the author – which is in a small box at the bottom left of the 'save as' dialogue box.

The journal adheres to the following definitions for peer-review recommendations:

Accept –   The article is currently of publishable standard and no changes are required, other than perhaps very small proofing, referencing, or house style issues.

Minor Changes –   A compelling and well-argued article that requires little alteration before publication which may include individual sentence re-writes, minor proofing problems, occasionally missing or incorrect references.

Medium Changes –   An article with a number of commendable or insightful aspects but some sections would benefit from a re-write before it is ready to be published. The article may require some extra research or re-structuring but is otherwise of favourable quality.

Major Changes –   An article which requires substantial or radical overhaul throughout, including extensive re-structuring or re-writing, but demonstrates evident merit that will still be of publishable quality following extended revisions.

Rejection –   An article which would require such extensive and substantial re-working that it would in effect be a new piece and would require peer-reviewing again before it could be considered as being of publishable quality.

Any concerns or questions, feel free to email editors@fantastikajournal.com

Many thanks,

C. Palmer-Patel and Kerry Dodd

I recommend this article for: Choose an item.

Please comment on the following:

- **The rigour of the article:**

    – Where appropriate, and if you are a subject specialist, the rigour of the article, its accuracy, and its engagement with relevant scholarly debates.
    – If you are not a subject specialist, how accessible is the article to those without an immediate knowledge of the texts, theories, concepts discussed?
    – Where would you mark it on a scale of 1 to 5 for rigour (5 being strongest)?

Click here to enter text.

- **The structure of the article**:

    – If articles are over or under-length (5,000 – 7,000 including notes and works cited) please make suggestions for sections that could be cut or need to be expanded upon.
    – You might also want to make suggestions about alterations to the structure of the essay that would improve the argument.
    – Is the article well-signposted and easy to follow?
    – Where would you mark it on a scale of 1 to 5 for structure (5 being strongest)?

Click here to enter text.

- **The fluency and cogency of the argument**:

    – Is it persuasive?
    – Does the article achieve the aims and objectives of the argument it outlines in the introduction?
    – Where do these aims or objectives stand in the wider Fantastika critical field?
    – Are these aims sufficiently critical or rigorous enough for an academic journal?
    – Where would you mark it on a scale of 1 to 5 for fluency and cogency (5 being strongest)?

Click here to enter text.

- Is the argument pertinent to the topic of the journal? (See CFP attached if it's a special edition.)

Click here to enter text.

- Are there clear research implications to the project? Is the argument original?

Click here to enter text.

- **Proofing errors and writing style**:

  - Problems with sentence construction, critical voice and address, etc. (Where small errors in spelling, punctuation, and sentence construction occur you may wish simply to change these in the document ensuring 'track changes' is enabled. If errors are recurrent, then simply mention this in a comment rather than changing each error via 'track changes'.)

Click here to enter text.

- Does the article appear to follow MLA citation? (Note that every reference does not need to be checked. Simply comment on overall referencing style and check to see that the references are there and complete. Please refer to our 'MLA Cheat Sheet' if you are unsure of this style.)

Click here to enter text.

- Do you have any extra comments that you would like to pass on to the author?

Click here to enter text.

- Do you have any extra comments that you would like to pass on to the editors? (These will not be passed to the author)

Click here to enter text.